

REMARKS

The examiner rejected claims 2-4 under 112 stating the specification as originally filed does not provide an adequate description of what is the claimed cramp.

The word “cramp” is being used as in the dictionary definition, “an adjustable frame to hold pieces”, or “to steer or make turn”.

The word “cramp” appears in the originally filed application on page 2 , line 16, Page 2 line 38, page 4 lines 15 and 16, and on page 5 line 12. The cramp is labeled by reference number 23 and is shown in Figures 1, 2 and 7 in conjunction with the specification. In the publication the word Cramp appears in Paragraphs 0006, 0012, 0031 and 0036.

It is therefore believed that the word cramp is adequately described in the specification and shown in the drawings enough to support the claims.

The examiner objected to claims 2-4 for failing to further limit the claims in a dependent claim.

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and further limits the previously claimed element of the telescopic arm as having “two parts interconnected with a pivoting mechanism attached at its end to a cramp by a vertical rotating mechanism” thus further limiting the telescopic arm structure.

It appears to be in proper dependent form.

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 2 and further limits the cramp, a previously claimed element in claim 2, as having an outside platform with a barrier.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3 and further limits the outside platform, a previously claimed element in claim 3, as having a cabin hung the outside platform by a rotating connection.

Therefore claims 2-4 have further limitations and are in proper dependent form.

The examiner objected to claim 6 as not having an antecedent basis for “the two elevators”.

The two elevators are called out in the claims as the elevator portion and the autonomous rescue elevator. In order to avoid confusion the claims have been amended to replace “the two elevators” with “the elevator portion and the autonomous rescue elevator”.

The examiner objected to claim 8 as not having an antecedent basis for the “passenger compartment” having the control panel.

Claim 8 has been amended to provide a proper antecedent basis.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 as being obvious over Cox in view of Boeker.

The prior art cited does not have the elements of the claim as “the crane portion having a rotating mechanism and a pivoting mechanism for supporting one end of a telescopic arm, the telescopic arm having a platform at the other end for reaching any position on or above a building” is missing from the prior art cited. Therefore the combination of Cox and Boeker does not yield the claimed invention.

Neither Cox or Boeker have a telescopic arm supporting a platform. Further the telescopic arm would need a rotating mechanism and a pivoting mechanism to meet the elements of claim 1. The arm 88 supporting the platform in Cox is not a telescopic arm therefore its length is fixed whereas the claim has a telescopic arm which is extendable.

Claim 2 further limits claim 1 by having a cramp with a rotating and pivoting mechanism to hold and move the platform which neither Cox or Boeker have. Therefore claim 2 is not obvious in view of the combination of Cox in view of Boeker.

Claim 3 further limits claim 2 by having an outside platform with a barrier on the cramp which, neither Cox or Boeker have. Therefore claim 3 is not obvious in view of the combination of Cox in view of Boeker.

Claim 4 further limits claim 3 by having a cabin hung from the outside platform by a rotating connection, which neither Cox or Boeker have. Therefore claim 4 is not obvious in view of the combination of Cox in view of Boeker.

Claim 8 further limits claim 1 by having a control panel in the elevator, which neither Cox or Boeker have. Therefore claim 8 is not obvious in view of the combination of Cox in view of Boeker.

Claim 9 further limits claim 1 by having a working surface of a rail has a guiding slot, which neither Cox or Boeker have. Therefore claim 9 is not obvious in view of the combination of Cox in view of Boeker.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 as being obvious over Boeker in view of Cox.

The prior art cited does not have the elements of the claim as “the crane portion having a rotating mechanism and a pivoting mechanism for supporting one end of a telescopic arm, the telescopic arm having a platform at the other end for reaching any position on or above a building” is missing from the prior art cited. Therefore the combination of Boeker and Cox does not yield the claimed invention.

Neither Boeker or Cox have a telescopic arm supporting a platform. Further the telescopic arm would need a rotating mechanism and a pivoting mechanism to meet the elements of claim 1. The arm 88 supporting the platform in Cox is not a telescopic arm therefore its length is fixed whereas the claim has a telescopic arm which is extendable.

Claim 2 further limits claim 1 by having a cramp with a rotating and pivoting mechanism to hold and move the platform which neither Boeker or Cox have. Therefore claim 2 is not obvious in view of the combination of Boeker in view of Cox.

Claim 3 further limits claim 2 by having an outside platform with a barrier on the cramp which, neither Boeker or Cox have. Therefore claim 3 is not obvious in view of the combination of Boeker in view of Cox.

Claim 4 further limits claim 3 by having a cabin hung from the outside platform by a rotating connection, which neither Boeker or Cox have. Therefore claim 4 is not obvious in view of the combination of Boeker in view of Cox.

Claim 8 further limits claim 1 by having a control panel in the elevator, which neither Boeker or Cox have. Therefore claim 8 is not obvious in view of the combination of Boeker in view of Cox.

Claim 9 further limits claim 1 by having a working surface of a rail has a guiding slot, which neither Boeker or Cox have. Therefore claim 9 is not obvious in view of the combination of Boeker in view of Cox.

The examiner stated that claims 5-7 were objected to as being based on rejected base claims but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations of base claim 1. Claims 6 and 7 are dependent claims based on claim 5.

New claims have been added to depend on the allowable claims 5-7.

All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.